



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,171	10/17/2003	Craig Bonsignore	CRD-5056	9527
27779	7590	06/17/2008		
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			EXAMINER SONNETT, KATHLEEN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,171

Applicant(s)

BONSIGNORE, CRAIG

Examiner

KATHLEEN SONNETT

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: "apeces" in line 7 of claim 10 should read either "apexes" or "apices" (both correct plural spellings of apex). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 10 and 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen et al. (WO 03/022178). Andersen et al. discloses an intraluminal medical device, which may be made of nitinol, having an unexpanded and expanded configuration comprising multiple tubular stent segments, each tubular stent segment including a plurality of longitudinal struts, a plurality of loops connecting adjacent longitudinal struts, the plurality of longitudinal struts being connected on opposite ends by the loops to form a substantially S-shape configuration, and one or more bridging elements extending from one or more apexes of the plurality of loops, the one or more bridging elements comprising a tapered narrow section and a top section, the bridging elements being staggered on each stent segment such that the bridging element on one stent segment fits in the gap created by the tapered narrow section and anvil section of two bridging elements on an adjacent stent segment when the intraluminal medical device is in the unexpanded configuration and wherein when the intraluminal device in

Art Unit: 3731

the expanded configuration, each stent segment is physically isolated from an adjacent stent segment (see last line of abstract and embodiment shown in fig. 11).

4. The bottom portion of the bridging element (34) as seen in fig. 11 can be considered a tapered narrow portion compared to (34) at its widest part, bridging element (34) extending from the apex of a loop. The circular top does not form an anvil shape. However, Andersen et al. discloses that shapes of the bridging element (34) other than those disclosed in fig.11 can be used to form the interlocking connection between the stent segment bridging elements (34) (for example, see fig. 10). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the shape of portion (34) to include an anvil portion since it has been held that a mere change in shape involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1996)).

5. **Claims 12-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen et al. in view of Davila et al. (U.S. 6,863,685). Andersen et al. discloses the invention substantially as described above, further disclosing that the medical device is made of a nickel titanium alloy. Andersen et al. fails to expressly disclose the amount of nickel and the amount of titanium present in the nickel-titanium alloy.

6. However, Davila et al. discloses that it is old and well known in the art to make a stent from a superelastic alloy of Nitinol comprising about fifty to about sixty percent Nickel and the remainder titanium. Davila et al. states that the superelastic design of the stent makes it crush recoverable which makes it useful as a stent or frame for any number of vascular devices in different applications (col. 6 lines 32-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device disclosed by Andersen et al. to include the improvements disclosed by Davila et al. in order to gain the advantages of a medical device that is crush recoverable.

7. Regarding claims 13 and 14, Andersen et al. fails to disclose the addition of one or more radiopaque markers. However, Davila et al. discloses that it is old and well known in the art to use radiopaque markers in a stent medical device. Davila et al. further discloses that radiopaque markers ensure proper positioning of the device within a lumen (col. 5, lines 9-11). Davila et al. states that the markers may be positioned at other locations on the stent (col. 12 lines 52-53) and markers may be utilized to determine when and if a stent is fully deployed (col. 10, lines 64- 65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Andersen et al. to include the improvements made obvious by Davila et al. in order to gain the advantage of being able to ensure proper positioning of the device within a lumen. Positioning the markers into the bridging elements would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in order to determine when and if each segment of the stent is fully deployed.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3731

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KATHLEEN SONNETT whose telephone number is (571)272-5576. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, M-F, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Manahan can be reached on 571-272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KCS 6/11/2008

/Todd E Manahan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731